



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/026,941

12/27/2001

Jung Taeck Yer

049128-5029

7312

9629

7590

08/03/2006

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

MAI, ANH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2832

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,941	Applicant(s) YER ET AL.	
	Examiner Anh T. Mai	Art Unit 2832	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9, 18 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banzi in view of Motomura [6384704].

Banzy discloses:

- a bobbin wound with a coil 240 and two E-shaped cores 250, 255 introduced into the bobbin;
- the bobbin provided with a coil winding part having no protrusion member so as to exclude an interference caused by the protrusion member;
- a pair of lead pins 220 each extending from opposing ends of the bobbin along opposing direction parallel to the length of the bobbin;
- two E-cores having centers 252, 257 passing through a center of the bobbin and sidewall portions surrounding sides of the bobbin as shown in figure 2.

Banzy discloses the invention as claimed as cited above except for the coil continuously wound starting from one end of the coil to the other end thereof and connected to pins on the primary and secondary sides. Motomura discloses winding 12 wound from one end of the winding part and terminating at another end thereof and connected to lead pins 14b and 16 of primary side

Art Unit: 2832

and secondary side as shown in figure 2 and abstract. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the winding wound as taught by Motomura to the magnetic device as disclosed by Banzi. The motivation would have been to prevent disconnecting of secondary winding. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Motomura with Banzi.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 11-12, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banzi in view of Motomura as applied in claim 10 above and further in view of Kawano.

Banzi in view of Motomura discloses the invention as claimed as cited above except for the coil continuously wound from one side of the coil winding part to another side on a zigzag basis in an oblique direction. Kawano discloses the coil continuously wound from one side of the coil winding part 510a to the other side 510b on a zigzag basis in an oblique direction [figure 6, col 11, lines 21-30].

With respect to claim 14, Kawano's winding having winding block wherein the coil is continuously wound from a lower portion to an upper portion such that the coil blocks have a number of winding [see left bottom corner of figure 6]. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to wind the coil continuously in zigzag

Art Unit: 2832

basis from one side to the other as taught by Kawano to the coil as disclosed by Banzi. The motivation would have been to eliminate undesirable excursion of wire rod therefore it becomes possible to prevent deterioration of insulation quality due to winding collapse [col 11, lines 38-44]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kawano with Banzi in view of Motomura.

With respect to claim 12, the coil is continuously wound from one side of the coil winding part to the other side.

With respect to claim 15, the coil is wound from lower portion to upper portion as shown in fig 6.

4. Claims 13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banzi, Jr. et al. in view of Motomura and further in view Kawano as applied in claims 12 and 14 above and further in view of Takebuchi.

Banzi in view of Motomura further in view of Kawano discloses the invention as claimed as cited above except for the coil is coated with an adhesive so as to prevent collapse during the winding process. Takebuchi discloses an adhesive applied to around the copper line so that winding collapse of coil is prevented [solution]. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply adhesive as taught by Takebuchi to the coil as disclosed by Banzi in view of Motomura and further in view Kawano. The motivation would have been to prevent the winding collapsed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Takebuchi with Benzi in view of Motomura and further in view of Kawano.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh T. Mai whose telephone number is 571-272-1995. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2832

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

072506

AM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anh Mai', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ANH MAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER